Office - Supreme Court
FILED
APR 3 19
CHARLES ELMORE

No. 1049

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

STATE OF TEXAS,

Petitioner,

vs.

ALBERTO BALLI, ET AL.,

Respondents

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND SUPPORTING BRIEF.

GROVER SELLERS,
Attorney General of Texas,
WM. J. FANNING,
Assistant Attorney General,
JACK W. ROWLAND,
Assistant Attorney General,
Capitol Building,
Austin, Texas;
FAGAN DICKSON,
1406 Capital Nat'l Bank Bldg.,
Austin, Texas,
Attorneys for Petitioner, State of Texas.

April 3, 1946.

INDEX

	Page
Petition for writ of certiorari	1
Short statement of the case	1
Basis of jurisdiction	5
Questions presented	10
Reasons for granting the writ	15
Prayer	17
Brief in support of application	19
Opinions below	19
Grounds of jurisdiction	19
Statement of the case	20
Specifications of error	25
Summary of argument	26
Argument	32
(1) The Attorney General of Texas has authority to apply for a writ of certiorari on behalf of the State	32
(2) The portion of Padre Island covered by the original Mexican survey	33
(3) Accretions on the seashore belong to The Sovereign under the Law of Tamaulipas, Mexico	43
(4) The Federal questions that were raised and that are necessarily involved	50
(a) The Federal questions under the Annexation Agreement	50
(b) The Federal questions under the Colonization Law of Mexico	56
(c) The Federal questions under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo	58
(d) The Federal questions under the Texas Act of August 15, 1870 and Section 8, Article Fourteen of the Texas Constitution	60
(5) The Court may decree a forfeiture in the present suit	71
(6) The State is not barred by limitations or estoppel	75

Page

(7) There is no possibility of a Spanish grant.. 78
(8) Cases in this Court involving Mexican or Spanish grants in Texas..... 82
Appendix 86
(1) Joint Resolutions Comprising the Annexation Agreement 86
(2) Pertinent Portions of The Texas Act of February 10, 1852 94
(3) Article VIII of The Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo 95
(4) Section 4, Article 13 of the Texas Constitution 96
(5) Article 88, Vol. 1, Sayles' Early Laws of Texas 97

LIST OF CASES

Abie State Bank v. *Bryan*, 282 U. S. 765, 773..... 66
Ainsa v. *United States*, 184 U. S. 639 39
Ainsa v. *United States*, 161 U. S. 208..... 39
Airhart v. *Massieu*, 98 U. S. 491, 496, 25 L. Ed. 213.. 54
Amaya, et al. v. *Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.*, 62 Fed. Supp. 181, 195 ..... 17, 59
Barker v. *Harvey*, 181 U. S. 481..... 17, 31
Basse v. *City of Brownsville* (1874), 154 U. S. 610, 22 L. Ed. 420..... 14, 17, 59, 82
Borax Consolidated v. *City of Los Angeles*, 296 U. S. 10, 15, 19, 22 ..... 39, 50
Bottiller v. *Dominguez*, 130 U. S. 238..... 32
Bowmer v. *Hicks*, 22 Tex. 155..... 71
Boynton v. *Hutchinson Gas Company*, 292 U. S. 601 32
Brenkerhoff-Faris Trust & Savings Co. v. *Hill*, 281 U. S. 673 66
Brewer-Elliott Oil and Gas Co. v. *United States*, 260 U. S. 77, 87 50
Broad River Power Co. v. *South Carolina*, 281 U. S. 537, 540 65
Camou v. *United States*, 171 U. S. 277..... 39
Cavazos v. *Trevina* (1867), 6 Wall. (73 U. S.) 773, 18 L. Ed. 813 82

Page

Central Vermont Ry. Co. v. *White*, 238 U. S. 507 50
Christy v. *Pridgeon* (1886), 4 Wall. 196, 18 L. Ed. 322 .... 16, 57, 82
City of Austin v. *Hall*, 93 Tex. 591, 57 S. W. 563 38
City of San Antonio v. *Earnest* (Tex. Sup. Ct.), 188 S. W. (2d) 775 77
City Service Co. v. *Dunlap*, 308 U. S. 208 52
Clark v. *Hills*, 67 Tex. 141, 2 S. W. 356 56
Cowan v. *Hardeman*, 26 Tex. 217, 226 42
Cox v. *Robison*, 105 Tex. 426, 150 S. W. 1149, 1156 .... 42, 43
Creswill v. *Grande Lodge, Knights of Pythias of Ga.*, 225 U. S. 246, 261, 262 .... 53, 71
Curry v. *Port Lavaca Channel & Dock Co.*, Tex. Civ. App., 25 S. W. (2d) 987 39
Davis v. *Wechsler*, 263 U. S. 22 53
Day Land and Cattle Co. v. *State*, 68 Tex. 526, 4 S. W. 865 .... 32, 51, 75
Dincans v. *Keeran*, Tex. Civ. App., 192 S. W. 603 39
Edwards v. *Davis*, 3 Tex. 321 79
Ely's Admr. v. *U. S.*, 171 U. S. 220 .... 16, 30, 39, 40, 41
Erie Railway Co. v. *Tompkins*, 304 U. S. 64 .... 52, 57
First National Bank v. *Hartford*, 273 U. S. 548, 552 53
Fiske v. *Kansas*, 274 U. S. 380, 385, 386 .... 53, 71
Florida v. *Mellon*, 273 U. S. 12 32
Foote v. *Egery* (1850), 24 How. 267, 16 L. Ed. 656 82
Franks v. *Krohn*, Tex. Civ. App., 164 S. W. (2d) 529, error refused 32
Galveston City Surf Bathing Co. v. *Heidenheimer*, 63 Tex. 559 39
Gonzales v. *Ross*, 120 U. S. 605 .... 63, 82
Goode v. *McQueen's Heirs*, 3 Tex. 241 57
Grayson v. *Harris*, 267 U. S. 352, 358 70
Great Northern Railway Co. v. *Reed*, 270 U. S. 539 50
Hamilton v. *State*, Tex. Civ. App., 152 S. W. 1117, writ of error refused 50, 51
Harris v. *O'Connor*, Tex. Civ. App., 185 S. W. (2d) 993, writ of error refused for want of merit 77
Haynes v. *State*, 100 Tex. 426, 100 S. W. 912 66
Hoover & Allison Co. v. *Evatt*, October Term, 1944, 89 L. Ed. 852, 857 53

Page

Humble Oil & Refining Co. v. *State*, Tex. Civ. App., 162 S. W. (2d) 119, error refused 32, 77
Hynes v. *Packard*, 92 Tex. 44 39
Jones v. *McMasters*, 20 How. 8, 21, 15 L. Ed. 805 54
Kenedy Pasture Co. v. *State*, 111 Tex. 200, 231 S. W. 683, cert. den., 258 U. S. 617 ..... 75, 82
Ker and Co. v. *Couden*, 223 U. S. 268 ..... 16, 30, 45, 47
Kilpatrick v. *Sisneros*, 23 Tex. 113, 131 54
King v. *Putnam Investment Co.*, 248 U. S. 23 53
Knight v. *United Land Association*, 142 U. S. 161 50
Lawrence v. *State Tax Commission*, 286 U. S. 276, 282, 283 65
League v. *DeYoung* (1850), 11 How. (52 U. S.) 185, 13 L. Ed. 657 82
League v. *Egery* (1860), 24 How. 264, 16 L. Ed. 657 82
Lytle v. *Arkansas*, 22 How. 193 50
Manry v. *Robison*, 122 Tex. 213, 56 S. W. (2d) 438 38
Markowsky v. *Newman*, 134 Tex. 440, 136 S. W. (2d) 808 66
Maufrais v. *State*, 142 Tex. 559, 180 S. W. (2d) 144 38
McKinney v. *Saviego* (1855), 18 How. 235, 15 L. Ed. 365, 367 82
Mitchell v. *Furman*, 180 U. S. 402 ..... 31, 32
Miller v. *Letzerich*, 121 Tex. 248, 49 S. W. (2d) 404, 85 A. L. R. 451 54
Musquis v. *Blake*, 24 Tex. 461, 466 54
New York and Texas Land Co. v. *Thompson* (1891), 83 Tex. 169, 17 S. W. 920, 923 ..... 68, 73
Norris v. *Alabama*, 294 U. S. 587, 589, 590 53
Oklahoma v. *Texas*, 252 U. S. 372 ..... 32, 84
Packer v. *Bird*, 137 U. S. 661 50
Patterson v. *Alabama*, 294 U. S. 600 66
Pinkerton v. *Ledoux*, 129 U. S. 346 41
Ratliff v. *Burleson*, 7 Tex. Civ. App. 621, 25 S. W. 983, 984, 26 S. W. 1003 76
Reloj Cattle Co. v. *United States*, 184 U. S. 624 39
Rogers v. *Alabama*, 192 U. S. 226, 230, 231 66
Roseborough v. *Picton*, Tex. Civ. App. 34 S. W. 791 39
Schaeffer v. *Berry*, 62 Tex. 705 ..... 66, 67
State v. *Balli*, Tex. Civ. App., 173 U. S. (2d) 522 ..... 19, 50, 52

Page

State v. *Corrigan* (Tex.), 94 S. W. 101 ..... 56, 66
State v. *DeLeon*, 64 Tex. 553 ..... 39, 42
State v. *Delesdenier*, 7 Tex. 76 ..... 32, 51
State v. *Gallardo*, 106 Tex. 274, 166 S. W. 369, 373 ... 59
State v. *Jadwin*, Tex. Civ. App., 85 S. W. 490, writ of error refused 50, 51
State v. *Sais*, 47 Tex. 307, 318 58
State v. *Sais*, 60 Tex. 87 39
State v. *Sarnes*, 47 Tex. 323 65
State v. *Talkington* (Tex. Civ. App.), 274 S. W. 314, 316 76
Stewart v. *United States*, 316 U. S. 354 ..... 39, 50
St. Louis I., M., and S. Ry. Co. v. *Starbird*, 243 U. S. 592 50
Stover v. *Gilbert*, Tex. Com. App., 247 S. W. 841 ... 38
Sullivan v. *Texas* (1907), 207 U. S. 416 ..... 41, 56, 82
Texas Mexican Ry. Co. v. *Locke* (1889), 74 Tex. 370, 12 S. W. 80 63
Traveler's Ins. Co. v. *Marshall*, 124 Tex. 45, 76 S. W. (2d) 1007, 1012, 96 A. L. R. 802 66
Truax v. *Corrigan*, 257 U. S. 312 53
Union Pac. Ry. Co. v. *James Murphy*, 115 U. S. 1 ... 50
United States v. *Green*, 185 U. S. 256 39
United States v. *Hartnell's Heirs*, 22 How. 286 ..... 39, 41
United States v. *Maish*, 171 U. S. 242 39
United States v. *O'Donnell*, 303 U. S. 501 39
United States v. *Percheman*, 7 Pet. 51, 8 L. Ed. 604 . 54
United States v. *Pico* (1866), 5 Wall. 536, 18 L. Ed. 695 ..... 39, 58, 82
United States v. *Pink*, 315 U. S. 203, 217, 218 53
United States v. *Texas*, 143 U. S. 621 ..... 32, 84
United States v. *Texas*, 162 U. S. 1 ..... 32, 84
Ward v. *Love County*, 253 U. S. 17, 22 ..... 65, 66
Weatherly v. *Jackson*, 123 Tex. 213, 71 S. W. (2d) 259 at page 264 ..... 32, 76
White v. *Burnley* (1857), 61 U. S. (20 How.) 235, 15 L. Ed. 886 82
Wiederanders v. *State*, 64 Tex. 133 71

STATUTES, CONSTITUTIONS, TREATIES AND RULES

	Page
Act of August 15, 1870	8, 9, 61
Acts 26th Texas Legislature, 1st C. S. page 33, Chap. 11, Sec. 8	72
Article 23 of the Colonization Law of the State of Tamaulipas of December 15, 1826	35
Article 25 of the Colonization Law of the State of Tamaulipas of December 15, 1826	13
Article 4, Decree 72, of the National Colonization Law of Mexico of August 18, 1824	12
Article 11 of Colonization Law of Tamaulipas of December 15, 1826	12
Article 12, Decree 72 of the National Colonization Law of Mexico of August 18, 1824	13
Article 4622, 4623 and 4624 of Paschal's Digest of the Laws of Texas from 1754 to 1873	75
Article 88, Vol. 1, Sayles' Early Laws of Texas	65, 97
Article 5683, R. S. of Texas, 1911	76
Article 5420, Texas Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes	72
Article 5517, R. S. of Texas, 1925	76
Article 4410, R. S. of Texas, 1925	73
Article 7392, R. S. of Texas, 1925	46
Article VIII of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hildago	7, 95
Chapter 1 of Title LXVII, R. S. of Texas, 1895	75
Chapter 1 of Title LXII, R. S. of Texas, 1879	75
Common Law Rule, 2 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 177, 178, Vol. 1	44
Sayles' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 707	
Confirmation Act of February 10, 1852	24, 94
Joint Resolution of Congress of the United States of March 1, 1845	86
Joint Resolution of Congress of Republic of Texas of June 23, 1845	88
Joint Resolution of Congress of the United States of December 29, 1845	93
Joint Resolution of Legislature of Texas of April 26, 1845	94
Limitations Act of February 5, 1841	75

Page

Ordinance of the Texas Annexation Convention of July 4, 1845 91
Rule 802, Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 74
Section 237 (b) of Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. A. Sec. 344b) 5, 19
Section 39, Article 7, Texas Constitution, 1866 42
Section 9, Article 10, Texas Constitution, 1869 43
Section 4, Article 13 of the Texas Constitution, 1876 96
Section 2, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution, 1876 ..... 68, 73
Section 7, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution, 1876 43
Section 8, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution, 1876 ..... 9, 61
Section 2, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution, 1876 68
Section 18, Colonization Laws of Tamaulipas of November 17, 1833 42
Title 51 of the Acts of 1911 73

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1945

No. 1049

STATE OF TEXAS,

Petitioner,

vs.

ALBERTO BALLI, ET AL.,

Respondents

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

To the Honorable the Supreme Court of the United States:

Short Statement of the Case

This is an action on three counts by the State of Texas to recover on behalf of its Public Free School Fund the title and possession of Padre Island, or, in the alternative, an undivided interest in it. The suit was filed by petitioner against the King Ranch and the Estate of Robert J. Kleberg, dec'd, Sun Oil Company, Sinclair Prairie Oil Company, Gilbert Kerlin, the Estate of Pat F. Dunn, dec'd, and about 200 other defendants. Padre Island, the largest island in Texas, is 110 miles long, consisting of 135,213 acres (over 30½ leagues) of land. It lies along the southeast coast of Texas between the Nueces River, which empties

into Nueces Bay at Corpus Christi, Texas, and the Rio Grande, which empties into the Gulf of Mexico, near Brownsville, Texas.

The island was formerly within the jurisdiction of the State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, and from 1836, the date of the Texas Revolution, to 1845, when Texas entered the Union, it was part of the Republic of Texas. The island is a sandbar consisting chiefly of sand dunes, flats, salty bays, beaches and approximately 11½ leagues of pasture land which lies next to and parallel with the Gulf or Eastern shore. The west side of the island, which is separated from the mainland by the Laguna Madre, is very flat and barren (R. 122). The island varies in width from a few hundred varas to several miles. There are very few evidences of life on the island. The camps for cattle hands and shacks and other small houses built there have been periodically washed out and swept away by the tropical hurricanes which originate in the Carribean Sea and cross the Gulf of Mexico into Texas. Like the rest of Texas, which was once free range, it has been used through the years by various persons for pasturing horses and cattle. Unlike the rest of Texas, it was not affected by the advent of barbed wire, because the island itself was a natural enclosure. Up until recent years the island was considered as waste land and practically worthless, except for the purposes of pasturage. In 1876, when the people of Texas adopted their present constitution and set aside "one half of the public domain of the state—for a perpetual public school fund"[1] (Sec. 2, Art. VII) and released "to the owner or owners of the soil all mines or minerals that may be on same" (Sec. 7, Art.

---

[1] All of the remaining public domain has since been "set apart and dedicated to the permanent school fund." Article 5421c-3 Vernon's Ann. Tex. Civil Statutes.

XIV) no one thought that Padre Island had any mineral value. It was known, of course, that Nicolas Grisante and José Maria Tovar had in 1851 applied to a Commission, created by the Legislature of Texas to examine Mexican and Spanish titles to land between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande, for 11½ leagues of pasture land on Padre Island which they claimed under the State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, as successors in title to Nicolas Balli and Juan José Balli. It was known, of course, that the Legislature of Texas had in 1852 on the basis of the report of this Commission confirmed to "Nicolas Balli and Juan José Balli, eleven and a half leagues called 'Padre Island'." This claim, however, was never surveyed and no field notes or plats of it were ever filed in the General Land Office of Texas as required by Section 8 of Article XIV of the Texas Constitution of 1876. It was known, of course, that certain persons had paid State and county taxes on scattered portions of the island from time to time based on its valuation as pasture land but those payments were sporadic and the portions of the island on which the taxes were paid were never surveyed or located on the ground. It was not until recent years, when oil and gas was discovered on the mainland, that the island was considered as mineral bearing land. No wells have been drilled on the island itself, due to the unsettled condition of the title, but there is an oil and gas field near Corpus Christi, Texas, across the Laguna Madre from its northern end and several fields have been discovered along the coast from Corpus Christi, Texas, to Brownsville, Texas. The various claimants to the island have never made any effort to establish a title against the State of Texas until the present suit, except for the validation Act of 1852 which confirmed title to 11½ leagues, although the Legislature of Texas passed laws in 1860 (Act of February 11, 1860, 4 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1471-1473), in 1870 (Act of August 15, 1870, 6 Gammel's Laws

of Texas, 375-378) and in 1901 (Act of September 3, 1901, Gen. Laws, 1st C. S., 27th Legislature, page 4) which authorized them to bring suit against the State for this purpose.

The case was tried before the District Court of Nueces County, Texas, without a jury, and judgment was entered on March 30, 1942, denying all relief to the State. Hector Crandall and Kernel Hughes, et al., whose respective applications for a mineral lease on Padre Island from the State had been denied by the Commissioner of the General Land Office of Texas, were parties to the suit. Their prayers for relief were likewise denied. This judgment was appealed to the Court of Civil Appeals at San Antonio, Texas, and that Court on June 23rd, 1943, entered its judgment affirming the judgment of the trial court (R. 255). The opinion of the Court of Civil Appeals is reported in 173 S. W. (2d) 522-544. On November 3, 1943, the Supreme Court of Texas granted a writ of error and on December 20, 1944, judgment was entered (R. 386) affirming the judgment of the Court of Civil Appeals, with one justice dissenting. A motion for rehearing, with several supporting briefs, was filed by petitioner and on November 7, 1945, the Court overruled the motion for rehearing (R. 392) with dissenting opinions by the three regularly elected justices. On September 21, 1945, six new members had been sworn in as justices of the Supreme Court of Texas, pursuant to a constitutional amendment, which was adopted August 27, 1945. The six justices who overruled the motion for rehearing had been non-voting commissioners at the time the original opinion was handed down on December 20, 1944. The majority and minority opinion are reported in 144 Tex. , 190 S. W. (2d) 71, 101. An order staying the issuance of the mandate has been entered by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Texas pending disposition of this case by this Court (R. 393). The time

for filing the application for certiorari was extended to the 3rd day of April, 1946, by order of this Court entered the 15th day of January, 1946.

Basis of Jurisdiction

This Court has jurisdiction under Section 2, Article III of the Federal Constitution and Section 237(b) of the Judicial Code as amended by the Act of February 13, 1925 (28 U. S. C. A., Sec. 344, b) because,

1. The title of the State of Texas to Padre Island claimed under the first and second sections of a joint resolution of Congress of March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. at L. 797), being part of the Annexation Agreement between the United States and the Republic of Texas, is denied. Sections 1 and 2 of the joint resolution read as follows:

> "1. Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that Congress doth consent, that the territory, properly included within, and rightfully belonging to the Republic of Texas, may be erected into a new State, to be called the State of Texas, with a republican form of government, to be adopted by the people of said Republic, by deputies in convention assembled, with the consent of the existing government, in order that the same may be admitted as one of the States of this Union.
>
> "2. And be it further resolved,—*That the foregoing consent of Congress is given upon the following conditions, and with the following guarantees,* towit: First, said State to be formed, subject to the adjustment by this government, of all questions of boundary that may arise with other governments; and the Constitution thereof with the proper evidence of its adoption by the people of said Republic of Texas, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to be laid before Congress for its final action, on or before the first day

of January, one thousand eight hundred and forty-six. *Second, said State when admitted into the Union,* after ceding to the United States all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, ports and harbors, navy and navy yards, docks, magazines, arms, and armaments, and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense belonging to the said Republic of Texas, shall retain all the public funds, debts, taxes and dues of every kind, which may belong to or be due and owing to the said Republic; *and shall also retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, to be applied to the payment of the debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas, and the residue of said lands, after discharging said debts and liabilities, to be disposed of as said State may direct;* but in no event are said debts and liabilities to become a charge upon the government of the United States." Paschal's Dig., Laws of Texas, p. 44.

This proposal was accepted by the Republic of Texas by joint resolution of its Congress of June 23, 1845 (2 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1225-1227, Paschal's Dig. Laws of Texas p. 45, Sayles' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 1531) and by the people of the Republic by their deputies in a convention assembled for the purpose by an ordinance of July 4, 1845 (1 Gammel's Laws of Texas 1228-1230, Paschal's Dig. p. 45). The United States confirmed the agreement and admitted Texas into the Union on an equal footing with the original states in all respects, by a joint resolution of Congress of December 29, 1845. 9 Stat. at L. 108, Paschal's Dig., Laws of Texas, p. 46. The State of Texas asserted its ownership and control over said lands by joint resolution of its Legislature of April 29, 1846. 2 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 1461, Paschal's Dig., Laws of Texas, Art. 441.[2]

---

[2] The several joint resolutions forming the Annexation Agreement are all copied in full in the Appendix.

2. The judgment of the Supreme Court of Texas has misconstrued and misapplied the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico, which was concluded on the 2nd day of February, 1848, by holding that it is applicable to the land in suit. The portion of the Treaty involved here reads as follows:

"Article VIII

"*Mexicans now established in territories previously* belonging to Mexico [3] and which remain for the future within the limits of the United States, as defined by the present treaty, shall be free to continue where they now reside, or to remove at any time to the Mexican Republic, retaining the property which they possess in the said territories, or disposing thereof, and removing the proceeds wherever they please, without their being subjected, on this account, to any contribution, tax, or charge whatever.

"Those who shall prefer to remain *in the said territories* may either retain the title and rights of Mexican citizens, or acquire those of citizens of the United States. But they shall be under the obligation to make their election within one year from the date of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty; and those who shall remain *in the said territories* after the expiration of that year, without having declared their intention to retain the character of Mexicans, shall be considered to have elected to become citizens of the United States.

"*In the said territories,* that property of every kind, now belonging to Mexicans not established there, shall be inviolably respected. The present owners, the heirs of these, and all Mexicans who may hereafter acquire said property by contract, shall enjoy with respect to it guaranties equally ample as if the same belonged to citizens of the United States." 9 Stat. at L., 929, 930.

---

[3] Land in Texas in 1848 previously belonged to the Republic of Texas, and was not "territories previously belonging to Mexico."

3. The Supreme Court of Texas has held invalid under Federal Law a statute of the State of Texas of August 15, 1870 (6 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 375, 378), which, under the undisputed facts in this case, would bar the respondents from asserting any right or title to Padre Island. The material portions of this Statute read as follows:

> "Section 1. Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Texas, that any person who may be the original grantee, heir, or legal assignee of any grant of land emanating from the Spanish or Mexican governments, and having its origin previous to the nineteenth day of December, A. D. 1836, and situated between the Nueces and Rio Grande rivers, and below a line drawn from the northern boundary of Webb County to the mouth of the Moros Creek, emptying into the Nueces river, may file a petition to the District Court of the county of Travis, or where the capitol of the State may be; which petition shall be filed at least ten days before the time of holding of said District Court, and shall contain a full description of the land claimed, setting forth particularly its situation, boundaries and extent, and shall accompany such petition with the titles or evidences of titles or right under which the same is held or claimed; and the said District Court shall investigate the same in accordance with the laws of nations, the laws, usages and customs of the government from which the claim is derived, and the principles of equity, so far as the same are applicable, and shall give judgment for the confirmation of the same when the title is perfect; and when imperfect, when the same would have been matured into a perfect title under the laws, usages and customs of the government under which it originated, had its sovereignty over the same not been passed to and been vested in the Republic of Texas; provided, said title or right was originally founded in good faith; and provided, that no service of such petition shall be necessary."
>
> "Section 11. Be it further enacted, That all claimants under the act of February 10, 1852, and un-

der the act of February 11, 1860 and all claimants to grants which may be confirmed by the courts under this act, shall have their land surveyed and the field notes returned to the General Land Office by the first day of January, A. D. 1875, or their claims shall be forever barred and such lands shall become part of the public domain of the State.[4]

5. The Supreme Court of Texas has held invalid under Federal Law Section 8, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution, which, under the undisputed facts of this case, would bar the respondents from asserting any right or title to Padre Island. This section of the Texas Constitution, which has not been amended since it was adopted in 1876, reads as follows:

"Sec. VIII. Persons residing between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande, and owning grants for lands which emanated from the government of Spain, or that of Mexico which grants have been recognized and validated by the State by Acts of the Legislature, approved *February 10th 1852, August 15th 1870* and other acts, and who have been prevented from complying with the *requirements of said acts* by the unsettled condition of the country, *shall be allowed until the first day of January 1880, to complete their surveys, and the plats thereof, and to return their field notes to the General Land Office; and all claimants failing to do so shall be forever barred;* provided, nothing in this Section shall be so construed as to validate any titles not already valid, or to interfere with the rights of third persons."

---

[4] The predecessors in title of respondents were "claimants under the act of February 10, 1852" but they did not comply with this statute or with section 8, Article 14 of the Texas Constitution.

Questions Presented

The following Federal questions are presented in this case:

I

Texas claims the title to 19 leagues (83,132 acres) on Padre Island as the successor to the Republic of Texas, which acquired title in 1836 from the Mexican State of Tamaulipas by virtue of the Texas Revolution. Texas entered the Union in 1845 under an Annexation Agreement between the United States and The Republic of Texas, to which Texas as a state and the people of Texas became parties. The respondents claim title to Padre Island by virtue of proceedings which Nicolas Balli and Juan José Balli, their predecessors in title, had with the State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, in 1827-30, and by virtue of an act of the Texas Legislature in 1852 which confirmed upon application by Nicolas Grisante and José Maria Tovar, also their predecessors in title, the title to 11½ leagues in Cameron County, Texas, called "Padre Island".[5] The petitioner admits the confirmation act of 1852 but contends that (1) the original title issued by the State of Tamaulipas in 1827-30 was void because it was not approved by the Chief Executive of Mexico as was required of all grants to lands lying within ten leagues of the coast. The respondents, therefore, have title only to 11½ leagues on the Island, the title to which was confirmed by the Texas Act of 1852; (2) Padre Island has since 1827-30 contained over 30 leagues of land and the National Colonization Law of Mexico of August 18, 1824, which governed the proceedings in 1827-30, limited the amount of land which could be granted to a single individual to six leagues. The grant to the Ballis, there-

[5] The portion of the Confirmation Act of 1852 applicable here is copied in the Appendix, pp. 94, 95.

fore, could not have been for more than twelve leagues; (3) the title papers from the State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, to the Ballis describe the land which the Ballis applied to purchase, which was surveyed for them and which was paid for by them, as 11.15 leagues of pasture land and not an entire island. This corresponds with the 11½ leagues of pasture land called "Padre Island," the title to which was confirmed by the Texas Legislature in 1852. The petitioner claims title to the balance of the Island, consisting of approximately 19 leagues (83,132 acres) of flats, sand dunes and salty bays.

A. It is necessary for this Court to ascertain the quantity of land, if any, which was conveyed to the Ballis by the State of Tamaulipas, as evidenced by the several instruments included in the Instructive Dispatch, a complete copy of which is in the record (R. 131-177), in order to determine whether the Annexation Agreement applies to any part of Padre Island. Three members of the Supreme Court of Texas, who alone constituted the Court until it was enlarged by Constitutional amendment adopted on August 25, 1945, say that *only* 11.15 leagues on Padre Island were granted to the Ballis by the Mexican government. Six members of the Court, who were non-voting Commissioners appointed by the Court and not members of the Supreme Court at the time the original opinion was handed down, hold that the instruments in the Instructive Dispatch had the effect under Mexican Law of conveying to the Ballis the whole of Padre Island, consisting of over 30½ leagues (135,213 acres). If the dissenting opinions are correct, Texas is being deprived of 83,132 acres of land to which she is entitled under guarantees by the United States as expressed in the Annexation Agreement.

B. The question also arises as to the construction and application of the provisions of Mexican law which prohib-

ited the sale of land within ten leagues of the coast, without the previous approbation of the Chief Executive of Mexico. Under this contention the "grant" would be void when issued regardless of the area called for, but it was later validated to the extent of 11½ leagues by the Texas Act of February 10, 1852. These provisions were:

(1) Article 4, Decree 72, of the National Colonization Law of Mexico of August 18, 1824 (1 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 39; Sayles' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 40) which provided,

> "There cannot be colonized any lands, comprehended within twenty leagues of the limits of any foreign nation, *nor within ten leagues of the coast*, without the previous approbation of the general supreme executive power."

(2) Article II of Colonization Law of Tamaulipas of December 15, 1826 (1 Gammel's Law of Texas, 455, Sayes' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 89) which provided,

> "Art. II. In the same manner he shall take care that no town projected by foreigners be situated within ten leagues upon the coast of the Gulf of Mexico within the limits of the State, without previously obtaining the consent and approbation of the Supreme Executive of the Union. Beyond said line he shall also take care that, so far as the sites permit, the new towns be established in contact with the present ones, and with the conditions he stipulates with the empresarios."

C. The question also arises as to the construction and application of the laws of Mexico limiting the quantity of land which could be held by one individual. These provisions were,

(1) Art. 12, Decree No. 72, of the National Colonization Law of Mexico of August 18, 1824 (1 Gammel's Laws of

Texas, 98; Sayles' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 40) which provided,

> "Art. 12. It shall not be permitted to unite in the same hands with the rights of property, more than one league square of land, suitable for irrigation, four square leagues in superficies, of arable land without the facilities of irrigation, and *six square leagues in superficies of grazing land.*"

(2) Article 25 of the Colonization Law of Tamaulipas of December 15, 1826 (1 Gammel's Laws of Texas, 458; Sayles' Early Laws of Texas, Art. 89) which provided:

> "Art. 25. The Chief Executive shall convoke those born in the republic for the occupation of vacant lands, who shall be preferred to foreigners in the order of the older date of the designations, and, in case of equality, the natives or inhabitants of the place to which the land designated belongs, shall have the first place, those of places within the state the second, and those of the other states of this republic the third, *and adjudication may be made up to the amount of one hundred and twenty-five million square varas.*"[6]

II

It is necessary for this Court to ascertain whether the Sovereign was entitled to accretions on the seashore under the Laws of Tamaulipas, Mexico, in order to determine whether the Annexation Agreement applies to this part of Padre Island. The majority opinion correctly holds "that the rights of the State and respondents must be determined in the light of the civil law in effect at the time of the grant as it existed in the State of Tamaulipas." (R. 349) If, under the Spanish Civil law, which was in force in Tamaulipas in 1827-30, the accretions on the seashore belonged to the Sovereign, as stated by Mr. Justice

[6] Five leagues.

Sharp in his dissenting opinion (R. 371), the accretions which have formed on Padre Island are "vacant and unappropriated lands" and belong to Texas under the Annexation Agreement. This is true, regardless of whether the so-called "grant" from the State of Tamaulipas to Nicolas Balli and Juan José Balli included the whole of Padre Island or only 11.15 leagues of land on Padre Island.

III

The Supreme Court of Texas has misconstrued and misapplied the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo by holding that it is applicable to Padre Island. This Court in *Elisha Basse* v. *City of Brownsville, Texas,* 154 U. S. 610, 22 L. Ed. 420, dismissed an application for a writ of error to the Supreme Court of Texas on the ground that:

> "In McKinney vs. Saviego, 18 How. 240 (59 U. S. A. V 367), it was decided that the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo had no relation to property included within the State of Texas."

IV

The Supreme Court of Texas misconstrued and misapplied the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo (1848), paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Federal Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution by holding, in effect, that under their provisions, section 11 of the Texas Act of August 11, 1870 (copied pp. 8, 9 above) was invalid. The majority opinion (R. 317) mentions this statute in connection with the Act of February 10, 1852, and Section 8 of Article 14 of the Texas Constitution and strikes the three down with one fell swoop. The majority opinion did not try to "construe" this Act as it did the others, apparently because the meaning is too obvious, and it did not hold this Act invalid under the Texas Constitution. The only grounds of invalidity relied on by the Court are Federal

grounds, and we must presume that the Court refused to apply and give effect to the statute for that reason only. This Statute was invoked and relied on by petitioner in exceptions to the admission of evidence in the trial court (R. 72) and in the Court of Civil Appeals (R. 268).

V

The Supreme Court of Texas misconstrued and misapplied the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Federal Constitution, and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution by holding that under their provisions Section 8 of Article 14 of the Texas Constitution (copied p. 9 above) cannot be enforced if its language is read in the sense in which it would ordinarily be understood and that it must be given a narrow and strained "construction" for that reason.

VI

The Supreme Court of Texas misconstrued and misapplied the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the Federal Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution by holding that Texas, by reason of these provisions, lacked the power to require by reasonable regulation, upon condition of forfeiture, that the claimants to Mexican or Spanish grants between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande, whose claims had been validated, complete their surveys and identify their lands within four years in order that the extent of public domain might be accurately ascertained.

Reasons for Granting the Writ

This is the first time this Court has been called upon to construe and apply the Annexation Agreement between the United States, the Republic of Texas, the State of Texas

and the people of Texas. The State of Texas long ago discharged its obligations under this compact by ceding to the United States "all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, ports and harbors, navy and navy yards, docks, magazines, arms and armaments, and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense belonging to the said Republic of Texas" and by "payment of the debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas." This is the first time that the State of Texas, as the successor to the Republic of Texas, has applied to this court for help in retaining the public domain which the United States guaranteed to it under the terms of said Annexation Agreement.

This is the first time that the Supreme Court of Texas has held that Texas was not entitled under Mexican grants to accretions on the seashore. This ruling is of tremendous importance to Texas since most of its 380 mile coast is held under Civil Law grants which were issued before the Common law was adopted in 1840. This holding is not in accord with the holding of this court in *Ker & Co.* v. *Couden*, 223 U. S. 268.

The holding of the Supreme Court of Texas that the previous approbation of the chief executive of Mexico was not necessary under Mexican Law to the validity of grants within ten leagues of the coast is not in accord with the holding of this court in *Christy* v. *Pridgeon*, 71 U. S. 204.

The erroneous construction of the Balli grant in the majority opinion of the Supreme Court of Texas has the effect of including more land in the grant than was originally intended by the Mexican government and presents a federal question of substance by reason of the guarantees which the United States gave to the State of Texas in the Annexation Agreement. This holding is not in accord with the holding of this Court in *Ely's Admr.* v. *United States*, 171 U. S. 220.

The Supreme Court of Texas has decided a federal

question of substance by holding that the State of Texas was without power, under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and the Federal Constitution, to provide for a forfeiture of Mexican grants lying between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande where the claimants failed and refused, after their claims had been validated, to have their lands surveyed and to file their plats and field notes in the General Land Office of Texas. This holding is not in accord with the holding of this court in *Barker* v. *Harvey*, 181 U. S. 481.

The holding of the Supreme Court of Texas that the respondents were protected under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in their claims to Padre Island is in conflict with the holding of this court in *Elisha Basse* v. *City of Brownsville, Texas*, 154 U. S. 610, 22 L. Ed. 420. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas has recently held in *Amaya et al.* v. *Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.*, 62 F. Supp. 181, that the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo is not applicable to land between the Nueces River and the Rio Grande, which land was in the former State of Tamaulipas, or to any land in the present State of Texas, on the basis of the holding of this Court in the *Basse* case. As this question of whether or not the Federal treaty is applicable is of tremendous importance, particularly to the large ranchers in Texas, whose titles, in many instances, are dependent solely on Mexican grants, the conflict between the holdings of the State courts and Federal courts on this point should be settled.[7]

Wherefore, petitioner prays for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of Texas, directing it to certify to this Court for review and determination the record and proceedings in Cause No. 8187, styled The State of Texas, et al., Petitioners, vs. Alberto Balli, et al., Respondents, on the

[7] As historical background for this point, as well as others, we have copied in the Appendix Article 88 of Sayles' *Early Laws of Texas*.

docket of that Court and upon hearing that the judgment below be reversed and judgment be here rendered in favor of petitioner and against respondents for title and possession of Padre Island, or in the alternative, for all of the Island in excess of 11½ leagues, or in the alternative for an undivided interest in Padre Island equal to the percentage which the excess over 11½ leagues bears to the total acres of the Island, and in any event for the accretions on Padre Island, or in the alternative, that the judgment below be reversed and the cause remanded, and petitioner prays for its costs.

Respectfully submitted,

GROVER SELLERS,
Attorney General of Texas;
WM. J. FANNING,
Assistant Attorney General;
JACK W. ROWLAND,
Assistant Attorney General,
Capitol Building, Austin, Texas;
FAGAN DICKSON,
1406 Capitol National Bank Building,
Austin, Texas,
Attorneys for Petitioner, State of Texas.